

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

ANTHONY M. SANDONATO

ON BEHALF OF

THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF

DOCKET NO. 2019-226-E

IN RE: SOUTH CAROLINA ENERGY FREEDOM ACT (HOUSE BILL 3659)

PROCEEDING RELATED TO S.C. CODE ANN. SECTION 58-37-40 AND

INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANS FOR DOMINION ENERGY SOUTH

CAROLINA, INCORPORATED

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.

A. My name is Anthony Sandonato. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite 900, Columbia, South Carolina, 29201. I am employed by the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff (“ORS”) in the Energy Operations Division as a Senior Regulatory Manager.

Q. DID YOU FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY AND AN EXHIBIT RELATED TO THIS PROCEEDING?

A. Yes. I filed Direct Testimony and one (1) exhibit with the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (“Commission”) on July 10, 2020.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to set forth and support ORS’s recommendations and evaluation resulting from the examination and review of Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated’s (“DESC” or “Company”) Supplemented Version of Chapter II.B.5 of the Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. 2020 Integrated Resource

Plan (“IRP Supplement”) and the supplemental information filed in the Company’s rebuttal testimony and exhibits..

Q. DOES THE COMPANY’S IRP SUPPLEMENT COMPLY WITH S.C. CODE ANN. §58-37-40(B)(1)?

A. Yes. The Company’s IRP Supplement filed and discussed in DESC witnesses Bell, Neely, and Lynch’s rebuttal testimony includes the elements required under S.C. Code Ann. §58-37-40(B)(1).

Q. DID THE COMPANY MAKE ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFIED IN YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. No. It is the Company’s position the additional dismantlement costs, site restoration costs, and incremental transmission costs necessary to support post-retirement voltage for existing resources potentially subject to early retirement would double count or overstate the costs and the Company declined to incorporate the change in the IRP Supplement. ORS witness Kollen discusses the impact of including these costs when modeling future resources.

Q. DID ORS’S REVIEW IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL FLAWS THAT REQUIRE CORRECTION IN THE IRP SUPPLEMENT?

A. No. However, ORS witnesses Kollen, Hayet and Barron discuss in their Surrebuttal Testimony recommendations that could improve future IRP proceedings and the Company implemented improvements that are addressed in the IRP Supplement. In addition, DESC stated it is supportive of creating a stakeholder process as recommended by ORS.¹ The Company should continue to work to ensure the accuracy of future IRP filings.

¹ Rebuttal Testimony of Eric Bell pp 27-28 ll. 16-4

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE ORS'S RECOMMENDATION RELATED TO THE COMPANY'S IRP SUPPLEMENT.

A. ORS recommends the Company continue to work with stakeholders through its planning process as well as incorporate all changes that were addressed in the IRP Supplement. Based on the changes filed by the Company in the IRP Supplement, ORS does not have any additional recommendations for the Commission.

Q. WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY BASED ON INFORMATION THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE?

A. Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental testimony should new information not previously provided by the Company, or other sources, becomes available.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.